

 Feb 73

1. How case (incident) (MHM)
in Nixon meetings
as models of Exce behavior
as revealed in PP, VN, CW
2. If war was to continue, something had
to go — First Amendt, Cong. checks on Exce.
Now, if N policy is to escalate aggression,
censure (for lies + murder), history
must remain silent (sep 1969-73)

1550E5

- Foreign analysts did not get info in 69, or 70. AR did; and Fullbright did.
- see p. 6, VC9(2) Mind on US role
[I now saw this was known to USG in late '63!
I now saw quality of our decision-making w/r/t Dim - (need to free them from it)
I now understood HCC's ties to Key - finding of responsibility, 1966

Cross-border ops into Laos from Jan 1964
(election campaign!)

b.JT

Knockingly lobby for Hong North, 1964.
Use of tanks; denied by USG - I was aware of this concession by USG (e.g. of reverse soldiers)

Decent Offensive of Jan - Nov 64 → RT
just like Success Offensive of Nov 67 → Jet

Case

6.54 I was aware of:

- Leads → transfer

or no prosecution

(England; ...)

Nils, See, Schles...

- Statement, no basis for pros.

(although I said...)

- No O.S.A. (China, Hans)

- Acts I'm accused of: → routine

(Huddleston...)

(I thought — "They will find a law...")

hints to my faith in "gov of laws"]

My Strategy of Case:

To make most powerful Estate
case possible against Estate & War:

- + Media
- Secrecy System
- Mislegality of War
- Unconstitutionality of war + other practices
- Deception of Cong, Public
- Conspiracy of Media, Congress, Courts
- Political Repression (vs. First and...

(If a strong case - i.e. strong Estate witnesses -
cannot be ~~made~~ presented, then consider
alternative approaches) (along with "technical"
means of getting off, + conflict).

(Option of co-counsel, radical counsel,
can be postponed till last minute)
Ask ^{for} Balala, as of judgment...

b.57: I am an expert on practices
under class. system.

I know that what I am charged
with is not a violation of those practices,
and I could never have been expected to
be prosecuted ever for those acts!

(class 1)

[FBI Report on: 206,000 book, etc.
England

or for "Escalating - a Penguin"

[note distribution]

(Hillis Wyo!)

b.59: that McN closed testing to FarrelCom
(to show deception)

(or: testing of Fillright; o'Nan, Young)

that Halpin on Quarry. (Hunt Client?)

Get C+C Study!

↳ How do I get to tell this story?

Who? Congress? Interview?

What if Congress leaks?

63: Get Alan, or talk with McN

↳ If McN won't talk, then subpoena?

- Show this motion to all knowledgeable people...!

With:

Is this the war crimes trial of the century, or the free speech[?] trial of the century?

What we did was OK because war was immoral...



For - anti-slavery
anti-lies

pro-Const (anti-Spec)



anti-aggression war (1965)

(pro-UN-Charter?)



anti-political-expression
(1st Amendt)

J



- My investigation of Geneva — for MCN, STM
based on Bator book
- Suppression of Korean War Crimes
from Keites RM
- Parker on torture of prisoners

} Tony

Case

- Was Gilpatric speech "communicating secrets to the enemy?"
(Answered by Pres — but is he not subject? Why not?
Obviously, no intent to harm...)
- Note whole "com with eng" project!
- U-2 : secret from US public
US public
allies
not from UK!
- Skybolt — secret from USAF, US Congress
not from UK! (which was followed
because RAF was funded by USAF, funded
by McN!)
- Color II : ^{missiles} secret from US public,
not from Pres; U-2 info sent from
US public.
- Xcos bombing... from US public.

Am Arbor speech:

several TS speech, play
to public, NATO allies, SU
(encourage them to do likewise)
(against of arms)

See S. Also see article

Ireland

S10P — secrets from Pres

(DE as witness)

Ideally: Com with Energy
file?

I Get DE D's from RAND — to show
effects of Secrecy System?
See for Rel to subpoena!?

Cite II — Secrets from Pres about nuclear.

Whaler runs:

- TS Control number: (or secret)
- list of those who saw it

Hilman told Australian about 4 winds, Discover.

Ullissi — one of talks on
"Lying in State."

Intent — to rigor state of processes.
(Who was guy who was resigning?)

Study: Aviation Week
(testing?)

Also op columns

Hanson Baldwin

Security briefings — do not include
prosecution

My job was violating regs

- to get info to JCS, SecDef, R&D, Pres, Mc6B
- system can't run without violating
- of crucial importance that these people know — which required violating.
- tf knew — not condoned (Dif SecDef)
- effects of seeing on Plans...

Name & stolen?

If I do, I would be glad return it.

~~Mr. ~~Adams~~~~ Can you "steal" info from public servants and give it to the public?

~~Mr. ~~Adams~~~~

The gov don't lost anyth — the steals
in question ^{will be} ~~are~~ sitting on the prosecution's
table — they're now left custody — they're
by submitted as evidence.

Do we plan "to try" Gow?

~~Mr. ~~Adams~~~~ The gov has indicted itself
— the PP; and put itself on trial by ~~him~~
the trial, Mr. Nixon + Mitchell has put
the Spec Counsel on trial.

1-8 Is not failure to prosecute any
and officers for leaks, const of the
and Services to the release of info,
i.e. a judge that material is not
"relevant to national defense"?

[Note: in 1954 I was investigated
for alleged leak of info that had appeared
in comp newspaper — + was told newspaper
edit was not finished (he might have
been suspended). Obviously, my "intent"
was taken into account; I was not
suspended, + was subsequently cleared for
TS.

Can: tell Britton why I was rejected
by the Society of Fellows, in order to attend in the
USMC —]

(Call Britton?)

Call Maj. Gen. [redacted]

§. 10 states that "The trial of the employee
[citizen? I am not by trial in states of
employee, etc. of CP Law or DAVO]
would be permitted committed to a trial of
the superior," "which is passing what
defendant's desire to occupying in this case."

["superior" ? My superior ?!
What country or I in ?

An official above the law ? How
an Pres' be brought to account ? Who are
the "superior" but the public ?

Nixon Seeks Plan

(NVA goes home)

(Since a good "deal" was not available in early 1969, when threat of Plan to SV + N. Viet) — to make a Deal (but available) only after winning off Hanoi + banking of NVN. (i.e. invasions of Cambodia + Laos): i.e. any escalation for which there was military/right-wing pressure.

(not: dikes, or mines, or invasion of NVN)
[Same hopes as with RT in '65.]

- (a) It is to work.
- (b) If it didn't, mil + Right couldn't complain.
- (c) Side - and long - effects of "demonstrating toughness" (could be claimed, as offering a bad deal in VN; esp. if good deals were likely to come about with SV + China agreeing, and could be claimed as result of toughness). (as WPB/JTF/McG hoped in '65)
- (d) Whatever deal results can be claimed to be good, or better than otherwise available, a "success," not a "defeat," forced by US.

lying

Epc

Recall: I applied for D-number for D on "lying..." and was asked to delete that D or change title over.

Even though I knew about lying from ^{ad 1965-67} 1964-65, and regarded it as under-rated problem as of 1964 study, I saw it as a problem to be handled within the Epc branch — like all problems of foreign policy.

See RAND seminar on Learning

Seminars in State on lying

RAND seminar on Crises; Slybolt

D on lying

Thus, I didn't see the Security Agency as a contract to conceal truth from the proper authorities. It wasn't till I saw the President/Epc as the problem, as the liars who could not expose or repudiate his best lies (Mossadegh), that I understood why Const. and Congress as proper authorities; and ultimately, public.